

### LEGEND

Staff Recommendations

- Expressway/Prime Arterial (6.1,2)
- Major Road Series (4.1)
- Boulevard Series (4.2)
- Community Collector Series (2.1)
- Light Collector Series (2.2)
- Minor Collector Series (2.3)
- Local Public Road (LPR)
- Fire Access Road (FA)
- Deleted/Unbuilt Road

Road Components

- Raised Median
- Continuous Turn Lane
- Intermittent Turn Lane
- Improvement Options\*
- Reduced Shoulder
- Proposed CE Roadway Standards

\* Passing Lane, Intermittent Turn Lane, Turnouts, Etc.

Matrix Key & Level of Community Concurrence

- # Agree
- # Minor Disagreement
- # Major Disagreement
- # No Action

July 18, 2006

Mountain Empire: Proposed CE Road Network

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>1A State Route 94</b> <u>Segment:</u> Boundary with Jamul to State Route 188 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<i>Draft Land Use Map:</i> <b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)  <i>Land Use Modification:</i> The staff recommendation includes changes to the Tecate land use map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Land use changes were needed in Tecate to reduce traffic volumes on State Route 94 to an acceptable LOS.</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – See Key Issues.</li> <li>• <i>Minimize Environmental Impacts</i> – State Route 94 passes through a number of wildlife preserves containing sensitive species and habitats. Additionally, visual impacts would be significant.</li> <li>• <i>Build Community Consensus</i> – The Policy Advisory Committee recommended that CALTRANS plan State Route 94 as a two-lane road<sup>1</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Note: Proposed land use changes reduced ADTs along State Route 94 by 7K.</b></p>
	<i>Board Alternative Map:</i> <b>Equivalent Classification</b> 4.1B Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lane (4+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – A four-lane road will accommodate forecast traffic volumes at a level of service D or better.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>1B State Route 94</b> <u>Segment:</u> State Route 188 to Buckman Springs Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<i>Draft Land Use Map:</i> <b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)  <i>Land Use Modification:</i> The staff recommendation includes changes to the Tecate Draft Land Use Map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See comments for 1A.</li> </ul>
	<i>Board Alternative Map:</i> <b>Minor Downgrade</b> 4.1B Major Road with Intermittent Turn Lanes (Only to Harris Ranch Road)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Road Capacity - A four lane classification is needed to produce an acceptable level of service</li> </ul>
<b>1C State Route 94</b> <u>Segment:</u> Buckman Springs Road to intersection with Old Hwy 80 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.1D Community Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>2 State Route 188</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire Segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Major Road (4+ lanes)	<i>Draft Land Use Map:</i> <b>Equivalent Classification</b> 4.1A Major Road with Raised Median (4+ lanes)  <i>Land Use Modification:</i> Includes changes to the Tecate Draft Land Use Map.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> - Land use changes were needed in Tecate to improve LOS on State Route 94 from F to D.</li> </ul> <b>Note: Proposed Improvements are not identified in the SANDAG 2030 RTP</b>
	<i>Board Alternative Map:</i> <b>Upgrade Classification</b> 6.2 Prime Arterial (6 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> - A six lane road classification is needed to produce an acceptable level of service</li> </ul>
<b>3A Potrero Valley / Harris Ranch Road (SC 680)</b> <u>Segment:</u> .75 mile from State Route 94 to Potrero Park Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector Road (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Downgrade</b> 2.3C – Minor Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> <li><i>Build Community consensus</i> – The Community desires bike lanes, sidewalks and curbs &amp; gutter included with the standard for this segment of roadway located within the Village.</li> </ul>
<b>3B Potrero Valley / Harris Ranch Road (SC 680)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Potrero Park Road to SR-94 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>4 Remaining Paved Road in Potrero</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire Segments <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lane roads <u>Current Classification:</u> Non- CE Roads	<b>Existing Classification</b> Map as Local Public Roads (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – Forecast traffic volumes are not sufficient to designate as a CE classification, nor do they meet the intent of CE Roads (to carry through traffic, goods and services). Also, dead end CE roads are discouraged</li> </ul>
<b>5A Buckman Springs Road (SF 1403)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Village Area, State Route 94 to southern boundary with Campo Tribal Land <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2C Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lane (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> <li><i>Appropriate Road for Land Use</i> – This classification selected to support town center planning effort</li> </ul>
<b>5B Buckman Springs Road (SF 1403)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Pine Valley Boundary to southern boundary with Campo Tribal Land <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>
<b>6A Old Hwy 80 (SC 1883)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Pine Valley Boundary to intersection with State Route 94 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>6B Old Hwy 80 (SC 1883)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Interstate 8 to Williams Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2C Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2+ lanes) at casino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>
<b>6C Old Hwy 80 (SC 1883)</b> <u>Segment:</u> State Route 94 to Ribbonwood Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes) to east side of CPA boundary	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2C Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> <li>• <i>Community Consensus</i> – The community would like to retain the existing two- lane road with turn lane.</li> </ul>
<b>6D Old Hwy 80 (SC 1883)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Ribbonwood Road to Imperial County Line <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> <li>• <i>Minimize cost</i> – No need to expand road to its build out capacity</li> <li>• <i>Community Consensus</i> – Staff recommendation is equivalent to community’s preference.</li> </ul>
<b>6E Old Hwy 80 (SC 1883)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Jacumba St to Laguna St <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2A Light Collector with Raised Median (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> <li>• <i>Build Community Consensus</i> – The community would like to develop a town like atmosphere, staff recommendation is equivalent to community’s preference.</li> <li>• <i>Support Land Use Goal</i>- Neighborhood commercial use will be supported by proposed road classification.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>7 Cameron Road (SA 250)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Minimize Costs</i> – Roadway not required for circulation as forecast</li> </ul>
<b>8 Oak Drive (SC 650)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>
<b>9 Lake Morena Drive (SC 660)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes) <i>Note: The mapped version of Lake Morena Drive does not show actual alignment, missing “S” curve.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>
<b>10 Cameron Truck Trail</b> <u>Segment:</u> Buckman Springs Road to Old Highway 80 <u>Existing Condition:</u> Dirt Road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Identify as Fire Access Road on community plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Road Capacity</i> – CE Road is not required</li> <li><i>Appropriate Road for Land Use</i> –Fire Access Road offers secondary egress during fire emergencies.</li> </ul>
<b>11 La Posta Truck Trail (SC 630)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> Dirt Road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Identify as Fire Access Road on community plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See No. 10.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>12 North Campo Truck Trail (SC 640)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> Dirt Road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Identify as Fire Access Road on community plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See No. 10.</li> </ul>
<b>13A La Posta Road (SC 620)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Old Highway 80 to State Route 94 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2F Light Collector with Reduced Shoulder (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – This road segment will operate at an acceptable level of service with the proposed classification.</li> </ul>
<b>13B La Posta Road (SC 620)</b> <u>Segment:</u> State Route 94 to Shockey Truck Trail <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – Unbuilt segment is not needed as other local roads provide more than adequate access and egress.</li> </ul>
<b>14A SC 590 (Shockey Truck Trail)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Intersection with State Route 94 to Boulevard CPA boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – CE Road is not required; a local public road is sufficient to handle future traffic.</li> </ul>



CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>14B SC 590 (Tierra Del Sol)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Boulevard CPA boundary to Tierra Del Sol <u>Existing Condition:</u> Dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Improve Connectivity</i> – Local Public Road is recommended to maintain local public road connection with Tierra Del Sol/ Shockey Truck Trail and neighboring community.</li> </ul>
<b>14C SC 590</b> <u>Segment:</u> Tierra Del Sol to East of Boulevard CPA boundary <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Build Community Consensus</i> – The community wants to remove road from CE Network and not use the corridor for public roads.</li> <li>• <i>Support Land Use Goal</i>– Low intensity development in a low density land use designation.</li> <li>• <i>Note:</i> Border patrol routes already in place</li> </ul>
<b>14D SC 590</b> <u>Segment:</u> Jacumba CPA boundary to Old Highway 80 <u>Existing Condition:</u> Unbuilt <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Delete CE Road</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See 14C.</li> </ul>
<b>15 Tierra Del Sol (SC 610)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Old Highway 80 to SC 590 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> Local Public Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Minimize Costs</i> – Low traffic volumes do not justify a CE road.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>16 Live Oak Spring Road (SA 240)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire segment <u>Existing Condition:</u> dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Build Community Consensus</i> – Community wants to delete dirt road from CE network as it traverses through private properties.</li> </ul>
<b>17A Ribbonwood Road (SA 210)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Intersection with Interstate 8 ramp to Lost Valley Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes, some dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b>  Local Public Road, Fire Access Road at the end of County maintained road to connect to Lost Valley Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Support Land Use Goal</i> – Dead End Road with Low intensity development.</li> <li>• <i>Improve Connectivity</i>- Fire access road needed to maintain connectivity and provide secondary egress.</li> </ul>
<b>17B Ribbonwood Road (SC600)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Old Highway 80 to Interstate 8 ramp <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Minor Upgrade</b> 2.2C Light Collector with Intermittent Turn Lanes (2+ lanes)  <i>CPG Preference:</i> <b>Equivalent Classification</b> 2.2E Light Collector (2 lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Minor upgrade needed for road to operate at LOS A -D; need intersection upgrade only.</li> <li>• <i>Note:</i> Minor disagreement; congestion was not identified during community review.</li> </ul>
<b>18 Mc Cain Valley Road (SC 580)</b> <u>Segment:</u> Old Highway 80 to Lost Valley Road <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes, some dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b>  Local public Road, Fire Access Road at the end of County maintained road to connect to Lost Valley Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Minimize Cost</i> – CE road is not needed in this location because of low-intensity use.</li> <li>• <i>Improve Connectivity</i> – Fire access road needed to maintain connectivity and provide secondary egress.</li> </ul>

CE Road Segment	Board-Endorsed Network	Rationale
<b>19 Jewel Valley Road</b> <u>Segment:</u> Old Highway 80 to SC 590 <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes, some dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Rural Light Collector (2 lanes)	<b>Remove from CE Network</b> Local Public Road up to end of County maintained road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See No.18.</li> </ul>
<b>20 Carrizo Gorge Road</b> <u>Segment:</u> Entire Length <u>Existing Condition:</u> 2 lanes, some dirt road <u>Current Classification:</u> Collector Road (4 lanes)	<b>Downgrade Classification</b> 2.2D Light Collector with Improvement Options (2+ lanes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Road Capacity</i> – Road will operate at LOS A-C.</li> <li>• <i>Build Community Consensus</i> – Community wants to see a wide enough R.O.W. maintained to accommodate future traffic associated with new border crossing.</li> </ul>